

REMARKS

Claims 33-55 and 57-64 are pending, of which claims 33, 59, 61, and 63 are independent.

Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

- Claims 33-35, 37-46, 50, 53, 57, and 59-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Weder (“Incorporation of photoluminescent polarizers into liquid crystal displays”). Furthermore, claims 36, 47, 51-52, 55, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Weder. Also, claim 54 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Weder in view of Vriens (U.S. 4,822,144). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The publication date of the Weder reference is February 6, 1998. The European priority document in the present case, *i.e.* EP 97111229, has a filing date of July 3, 1997, and is in the English language. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant claims are supported by the European priority document and, because that document pre-dates the Weder reference, withdrawal of the 102(a) and 103(a) rejections over Weder is respectfully requested.

- Also, claims 33-35, 37-46, 50, 53, 57, and 59-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f).

In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the inventorship as it presently stands is correct and kindly refer the Examiner to the Declaration/Power of Attorney that is of record in the present application.

- Furthermore, claims 33-47, 50-53, 55, and 57-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious¹ over Clausen (U.S. 5,122,557). In addition, claim 54 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clausen in view of Vriens.

¹ Applicants note that the Examiner uses the term “clearly anticipated by Clausen”. See page 3 of the outstanding Office Action. However, in view of the cite to 35 U.S.C 103(a) and the acknowledgment by the Examiner that “[s]till lacking is the high brightness, contrast or viewing angle”, Applicants assume the use of “clearly anticipated” was an inadvertent oversight.

In this regard, the Examiner contends that “[a]s the dichrioc [sic] ratios were well known as the primary thing to optimize for polarizers, one of ordinary skill would have known to maximize the dichroic ratio as it was the definition of functioning of a polarizer”. *See* page 3 of the outstanding Office Action.

Assuming, *in arguendo*, that the Examiner is correct that one of ordinary skill would be motivated to optimize the dichroic ratios for polarizers, Applicants still dispute that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would readily arrive at the present invention from studying Clausen. Note, for instance, the difficulties posed in reaching sufficiently high orientation levels via tensile deformation with the materials used by Clausen. Accordingly, in further view of the fact that the reference Vriens does not overcome the shortcomings in Clausen, withdrawal of the rejections over Clausen is respectfully requested.

For any and all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is patentable.

Because all rejections have been addressed and overcome, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is courteously solicited. However, if any questions remain, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

By: Richard Attenberg, #26588
for Paul L. Sharer
Reg. No. 36,004
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2180
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102